

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for reviewing the present application.

The description has been amended to insert an appropriate cross-reference to the related U.S. provisional application to which the present application claims priority.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 13-18 are allowed and that claims 3-12 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 has been amended to improve readability and to include features previously recited in claims 2 and 3.

Claim 2 has been cancelled.

Claim 3 has been amended specifying cofactor h in amended claim 1 as being 2, and removing the remaining features that have now been incorporated into amended claim 1. Claim 3 is also amended to depend on claim 1.

Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to correct grammar and typographical errors and claim 4 is amended to depend on claim 1.

Claim 6 has been amended for consistency with the amendments made in claim 1 and claim 3 and to remove the numbering for the sub-steps.

Claim 9 has been amended removing the numbering for the sub-steps.

Claims 13, 14, 16 and 17 have been amended inserting "and" prior to the final step in each claim.

No new subject matter is believed to have been added by way of the above amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyaji (US 5,373,755). Applicant believes that the amendments made to claim 1 and the cancellation of claim 2 render moot these rejections.


Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to specify that the elliptic curve has a cofactor h , the finite field is a binary field, and the function is an algebraic expression. These features were originally in claim 3, which has been deemed allowable. Applicant believes that

the generic expression "cofactor *h*" in claim 1 is more appropriate than specifying "cofactor 2" as was in original claim 3. In this way, claim 3 may specify cofactor 2 and claim 6 specify cofactor 4 without rendering claim 1 indefinite. Support for these amendments can be found on page 8, paragraph [0045] of the application as filed.

In view of the amendments made to claim 1 and the previous indication of the allowability of claim 3 (with claim 2 intervening), the rejections in view of Miyaji are believed to be rendered moot, and claims 1-12 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant requests early reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Brett J. Stanley
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 58,772

Date: March 5, 2007

BLAKE, CASSELS & GRAYDON LLP
Suite 2800, P.O. Box 25
199 Bay Street, Commerce Court West
Toronto, Ontario M5L 1A9
CANADA

Tel: 416-863-2518
BSL/